UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,647	09/29/2004	Gueorgui Momtchilov	2006579-1490 (CTX-101)	5646

69665 7590 03/16/2009
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER	
FAN, HUA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2456	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,647	MOMTCHILOV ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUA FAN	2456	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 January 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,24,28,68 and 77* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,24,28,68 and 77* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), filed on 1/21/2009 in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/21/2009 has been entered. Claims 1-20, 24, 28, 68 and 77 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that

(a) (on page 8 with respect to independent claims) Prior art Arteaga "fails to **track** an event notification regarding a device...not a device that is **separate** from the client".

(b) (on page 8 with respect to independent claims) Prior art Arteaga fails to teach "redirecting...before an operating system on the client can handle the event".

As to point (a), the arguments/remarks are not directed to the claimed invention and therefore are not being considered by Examiner.

As to point (b), the arguments/remarks are directed to the newly added limitation(s) and are responded to in the following rejections and/or further clarifications to the corresponding claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-20, 24, 28, 68 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, "redirecting said event notification to the server from the client, before an operating system on the client can handle the plug-and-play event" does not find support in the specification.

5. Claims 1-20, 24, 28, 68 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The independent claims recites "redirecting said event notification to the server from the client, before an operating system on the client can handle the plug-and-play event"; however it is not clear how the plug-and-play events (hardware changes) can be detected and redirected without involving client system's operating system at all, i.e., before a client's operating system can handle it.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-20, 24, 28, 68 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. See details in the "Enablement" rejection above. For the sake of examination, examiner assumes "redirecting said event notification to the server from the client, before an operating system on the client further handles the plug-and-play event".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 15 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al (EP 1187022), in view of Soin et al (US publication 2005/0091302).

As to claim 1, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client ([0042]), said method comprising:

detecting an event notification regarding a device in communication with a client ([0042], "When a Hardware Event or a User-Control Event occurs at the client device 12I, the client device sends a data message to the application 13I to identify the event and any accompanying parameters that further specify the event or data that is associated with the event") communicating with a server over a network (figure 1);

redirecting said event notification to the server from the client ([0042], "When a Hardware Event or a User-Control Event occurs at the client device 12I, the client device sends a data message to the application 13I to identify the event and any accompanying parameters that further specify the event or data that is associated with the event") before an operating system on the client can handle the event (refer to 112 rejections above and examiner's interpretation. Refer to [0042]-[0044], especially paragraph [0044], "upon receipt of event messages from client

device 12I, application 13I performs the processing specified by the commands in the application program" therefore the server performs further processing of the events), and

receiving, from the server, in response to the redirection of the event notification, a command directed to said device ([0042]-[0044], see especially paragraph [0044], "upon receipt of event messages from client device 12I, application 13I performs the processing specified by the commands in the application program…this processing culminates with a change to the user interface…Such change to the user interface accordingly is transmitted from the application 13I to the client device 12I").

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the events are plug-and-play events. Soin et al. discloses detecting plug-and-play events ([0112]-[0113]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding detecting plug-and-play events. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to discover devices (Soin et al., [0029]).

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to support different types of network topologies and multiple LAN protocols (Soin et al., [0073]).

Arteage et al and Soin et al have been cited as prior arts in the prior Office Action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

As to claim 11, Arteaga et al. discloses a method for handling events occurring at a client in communication with a server ([0042]; figure 1), said method comprising the steps of:

Redirecting from the client an event notification of a plug-and-play event regarding a device in communication with the client to the serve before an operating system on the client can handle the plug-and-play event (see similar rejection to claim 1);

notifying an application program hosted by the server of the occurrence of the event notification ([0042]);

receiving, in response to notification of the occurrence of the event notification, a command from the application program hosted by the server, the command directed to the device ([0042]-[0044], see especially paragraph [0044], "upon receipt of event messages from client device 12I, application 13I performs the processing specified by the commands in the application program…this processing culminates with a change to the user interface…Such change to the user interface accordingly is transmitted from the application 13I to the client device 12I"); and

Arteaga et al does not expressly disclose detecting plug-and-play events. Soin et al. discloses detecting plug-and-play events ([0112]-[0113]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding detecting plug-and-play events. See similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol. Soin et al. discloses the communication between client and server uses presentation-level protocol ("RDP" [0092]).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. with the method disclosed by Soin et al. regarding using presentation-level protocol for communication between client and server. See similar motivation in claim 1 rejection.

As to claim 77, see similar rejection to claim 1.

Arteaga et al and Soin et al have been cited as prior arts in the prior Office Action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

10. Claims 2, 4, 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lueckhoff et al (US patent 7171478).

Arteaga et al and Soin et al and Lueckhoff et al have been cited as prior arts in the prior Office Action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

11. Claims 5, 7, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of US Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coppinger et al (US patent 6982656).

Arteaga et al and Soin et al and Coppinger et al have been cited as prior arts in the prior Office Action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

12. Claims 6, 8, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., and Coppinger et al., as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Ferlitsch (US publication 2002/0114004).

Arteaga et al and Soin et al and Coppinger et al and Ferlitsch have been cited as prior arts in the prior Office Action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

13. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ferlitsch (US publication 2002/0114004).

Arteaga et al and Soin et al and Ferlitsch have been cited as prior arts in the prior Office Action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

14. Claims 24 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morris (US publication 2002/0159419).

As to claim 24, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising:

detecting a plug-and-play event notification regarding a device in communication with the client (see similar rejection to claim 1) but does not expressly disclose the event is an

emulated event. Morris discloses emulating plug-and-play event ([0020]-[0021]; [0023], lines 20-25).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding emulating a plug-and-play event notification. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to take advantage of USB technology, particularly the "plug and play" capability, to simplify the installation and use of Bluetooth-enabled and other wireless peripherals (Morris, [0010]).

As to claim 68, Arteaga et al in view of Soin et al disclose the method of claim 1 wherein detecting an event notification comprises:

detecting an event notification of a plug-and-play event regarding a device communicating with the client (see similar rejection to claim 1);

However, Arteaga et al. does not expressly disclose USB connection between the device and the client. Morris discloses a USB connection between device and client (abstract).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Arteaga et al. in view of Soin et al., with the method disclosed by Morris regarding USB connection. See similar motivation in claim 24 rejection.

15. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Arteaga et al., in view of Soin et al., and Morris, as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Lueckhoff et al (US patent 7171478).

As to claim 28, see similar rejection to claim 3.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUA FAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5311. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2456

/Ashok B. Patel/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456